

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT				1. CONTRACT ID CODE		PAGE OF PAGES 1 8	
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0001		3. EFFECTIVE DATE 03 June 1998		4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO. 982WCV		5. PROJECT NO. (If applicable)	
6. ISSUED BY CODE		N00167		7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than Item 6) CODE			
Naval Surface Warfare Center, Carderock Division Code 3321:Doris Rosenblatt (301) 227-3302 9500 MacArthur Blvd. West Bethesda, MD 20817-5700				(✓)		9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO.	
				×		N00167-98-R-0027	
				×		9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 24 April 1998	
				×		10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.	
CODE		FACILITY CODE				10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)	
11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS							
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> is extended, <input type="checkbox"/> is not extended.							
Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods: (a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning <u>1</u> copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.							
12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required)							
13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS, IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.							
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.							
B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103 (b).							
C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:							
D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)							
E. IMPORTANT: Contractor <input type="checkbox"/> is not, <input type="checkbox"/> is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the issuing office.							
14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)							
The purpose of this amendment is to respond to questions raised by potential offerors about the solicitation. Accordingly, the questions raised, and the Government's answers, are provided on the following pages.							
15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)				16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print)			
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR		15C. DATE SIGNED		16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY		16C. DATE SIGNED	
(Signature of person authorized to sign)				(Signature of Contracting Officer)			

1. Question: Given the questions we and others have raised concerning the RFP, can the closing date for receipt of offers be extended?

Answer: Yes, the due date is hereby extended by two weeks to 2:00 PM local time, 7 July 98.

2. Question: On Page 3, Section B, there appears to be an unfinished sentence or an inappropriate statement and a duplication of the first sentence on the page. Please clarify.

Answer: On page 3 the third paragraph is a duplication of the first. The second paragraph (incomplete sentence) is a duplication of the last two lines of the last paragraph on Page 2. The unfinished sentence and duplication are an oversight of text editing and pagination. Both should be deleted.

3. Question: On page 12, paragraph 3.1.1.1 refers to reference (B). Shouldn't the reference be (D), Contractor Qual Cards, vice reference (B).

Answer: Reference (B) directs the preparation, review, approval and implementation of "Technical Policy Instructions (TPI's.)" Implementation of LSV qualification requirements are directed by Administrative Instruction, AI-004 titled KOKANEE Qualification Program, as listed on Page 8 of Reference (B.) IAW this policy, set forth in Reference (B), Watch Station Personnel shall complete LSV qualification requirements.

4. Question: Pages 21 through 24 describe what the contractor will do in six task areas (4.1 through 4.6) in support of Task II. Area 4.6 is the Special Analysis Area. However, Section 1, Page 121, Task II Technical Understanding/Approach, lists just five areas, omits the 4.6 Special Analysis Area, and asks the offeror to present a narrative discussion with respect to just the five areas. Section M, Page 147, includes the same list with just five areas. The confusion is that, although 4.6 is one of six task areas, the RFP seems to state that 4.6 is not to be addressed by an offeror nor will it be evaluated by the government. It appears to us that this is may be an oversight. Please clarify.

Answer: Area 4.6, the "Special Analysis Area" is cited for unknown, future support requirements that cannot be anticipated at this time. The offeror does not have to address this task in its proposal nor will it be part of the evaluation criteria used by the Government.

5. Question: Page 23, Para 4.3: Is there any specific version of AUTOCAD that may be minimally required?

Answer: It's anticipated that throughout the period of performance of the resultant contract, that ARD AUTOCAD systems would update with the latest COTS software version release. Currently AUTODESK/AUTOCAD Version #14 is utilized, which is the current release.

6. Question: (Refer to Pages 38 and 39). Is the cost associated with the maritime longshoremen's and marine collision insurance required by the LIABILITY INSURANCE

REQUIREMENTS clause in Section H on pages 38 and 39 to be included in the CLIN 0003 not-to-exceed amount?

Answer: Whether such costs are charged as “direct” or “indirect” depends on the individual offeror’s Disclosure Statement with regard to how that offeror applies the Cost Accounting Standards in its organization. One rule of thumb is that if such insurance applies only to one contract, it would normally be charged direct, whereas if the contractor has multiple contracts that require such insurance, it would normally include such costs in an indirect pool. Offerors shall explicitly identify in their cost proposal how the Liability Insurance would be charged under the resultant contract.

7. Question: Page 117, B. Content and Format, what should the margins be set at?

Answer: Text margins should be a minimum of one inch top, bottom, left and right. Typical page header and footer information that the offeror desires to print on each page, such as page numbering, proprietary markings and/or proposal number, can be printed within the top and bottom margins.

8. Question: Page 117, B.1.b requests that the technical/management proposal be severable. Given the page limitations, can “This Page Intentionally Left Blank” pages used to facilitate section separation be excluded from the page count?

Answer: The page 117 B.1.b reference to severability relates to separating the technical/management portion of the proposal from the cost proposal. The requirement for severability should be implemented through the use of separate binders: One for the Technical/Management Proposal portion and one for the Cost Proposal portion of the offeror’s response to this solicitation. Section dividers shall not be included in the page count.

9. Question: Pages 117 & 118, Paragraph B.2. Length. It is clear that the 75 page limitation does not include attachments or resumes. Does that 75 page limitation include the Proposal Summary referred to at the bottom of page 118 or is that Summary to be considered "in addition to" the 75 page limit and does "a maximum of 75 pages" means 75 sheets of paper (150 printed sides) as opposed to just 75 printed sides?

Answer: The RFP is modified as follows (pp 117 & 118): **Length:** It is requested that a maximum of 150 pages, double spaced, double sided (300 printed page equivalent) of 12 pt type, including up to 8 foldouts be submitted for the Technical/Management Proposal. This page count is inclusive of any “Table of Contents”, “Index/ Lists of Tables, Figures or Acronyms”, “Proposal Summary” and “Example Delivery Order” responses. The 150 page limitation does not include resumes or attachments of a complex graphic nature (charts, matrixes or tables, etc) such that the information cannot be easily or clearly conveyed by a text description. No page limit applies to the cost proposal.

10. Question: (Refer to page 118) To save paper, can resumes be single spaced, double-sided, 12 point type.

Answer: Yes. Any supporting attachments (including resumes) which are not included in the page count limitation can be single spaced and double-sided, which is specifically encouraged by clause 52.204-4 which is incorporated by reference on page 40. The resumes should be in 12 point type consistent with the rest of the proposal.

11. Question: Page 118, SPECIFIC PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS: "The staffing plan for Task I requires the offeror to propose the labor categories, designate which are key, and propose the hours for each category." Page 119 (at the bottom), Paragraph 3., Task I Proposed Personnel, "The offeror shall identify and provide resumes for all personnel proposed for each position identified in the proposed staffing plan." The question is, are offerors to submit resumes for all (key and nonkey) Task I personnel or are resumes to be submitted for only key Task I personnel?

Answer: The offeror shall submit resumes for all key personnel, only. The offeror shall certify that all personnel proposed to fill non-key positions in support of Task 1 shall meet the qualifications and experience requirements identified in the offeror's staffing plan and that those personnel shall be available for Task 1 support.

12. Question: Page 122, Paragraph 2.a. General, last sentence. "Submit at least the number of personnel resumes, and a. current performance appraisal, indicated for each key labor category." We ask that the requirement for a performance appraisal be deleted. An employee's performance appraisal is considered a highly confidential document and we feel that releasing such an appraisal, even, to the government under proposal circumstances, could put the company in serious jeopardy in terms of violating Privacy Act laws and regulations.

Answer: The requirement for a current performance appraisal is deleted. The offeror shall certify that all personnel proposed have been given at least a "satisfactory" performance rating for the previous three years of employment prior to the RFP Closing date.

13. Question: On Page 123, the RFP requires that each resume include a certification to "consent to the disclosure of any resume (or other personal data)..." Request that the phrase "(or other personal data)" be removed from the certification as a violation of the Privacy Act.

Answer: The phrase "other personal data" is deleted from the resume certification Statement and from the sentence immediately above the certification statement itself. The certification statement is revised to read:

I consent to the disclosure of this resume for evaluation purposes regarding the proposal (offeror's name) submitted to CDNSWC under solicitation N00167-98-R-0027 and certify that this information is correct to the best of my knowledge.

Date

Employee Signature

14. Question: Requirements listed for Acoustic & Vibration Engineering support are confusing. Page 122 lists an Acoustic & Vibration Engineer, but the job description is for an Acoustic & Vibration Engineer, Senior. Page 131 has a job description for a non-Key Acoustic & Vibration Engineer, but the labor category is not listed on Page 128. Please clarify.

Answer: Page 126, Paragraph 5 – delete “Senior” from the Job Description Title. Paragraph 3 on Page 131 should be deleted from this page. This “position” is a Key Position with qualification requirements addressed in Paragraph 5, Page 126.

15. Question: Page 127 Mechanical Engineer, Senior - Key Labor Category. In the Any Experience Section: It is noted that item (e) states “submarine R&D Model facility design and test support” this seems rather restrictive. Is it mandatory that experience in “model facilities” would only be valid or could a company having other facilities design related qualifications in DOD programs such as R&D facilities and Laboratories in general also qualify under this requirement. One would seem to believe the same engineering design qualifications, skills and disciplines would equally apply in all cases.

Answer: Design criteria for undersea facilities and test configurations must take into consideration additional factors and/or limitations that are not typical design issues for shore based (in air) facilities or tests, particularly in the areas of installation and maintenance. The ARD is a host site to submarine model test facilities. The areas cited under the Recent Experience and Any Experience sections on Page 127 summarize anticipated Mechanical Engineering work areas at the ARD. A proposed individual would receive a higher evaluation score if engineering experience is directly related to the type of submarine facility design work and test support conducted at the ARD.

16. Question: On page 130, should the paragraph labeled “c. Labor Categories...” be “b.” or is subparagraph “b.” missing?

Answer: The section titled Labor Categories and Description of Qualifications: on Page 130 should be labeled as subparagraph b. vice c.

17. Question: Page 131, Paragraph 3 describes the qualifications for the "Acoustic & Vibration Engineer" category. However, this is the only place in the RFP that this category is addressed. It is not included in the non-key category lists on Pages 128, 129, or 130. Should Paragraph 3 on Page 131 be deleted from the RFP or is there an error with respect to the category listings on Pages 128 - 130?

Answer: See answer to question 14 above.

18. Question: On page 132, the education required for the Systems Engineer (Hardware) is “4 years experience in software development and maintenance”. This is that same education requirement as for the Systems Engineer (Software). Is the educational requirement as stated correct for the Systems Engineer (Hardware)?

Answer: No. Education Requirements for Paragraph 6. “System Engineer (Hardware) – NON-KEY” is revised: Bachelors degree and 4 years experience in hardware development and maintenance.

19. Question: Page 139, C. Cost Proposal, What start date should we use for pricing?

Answer: October 1, 1998 should be used as an anticipated date of award for pricing and escalation purposes.

20. Question: Page 140, paragraph C.2(a) requests an estimate for per diem and travel. Are these considered to be additional costs that should be added to the CLIN 0003 amount in Section B?

Answer: No. Page 140, Paragraph 2, (a) through (c), lists the costs that the offeror proposes for the CLIN 0001 estimated costs. The amount of overtime, travel, and per diem associated with fluctuations in workload in performance of Task I should be clearly identified in the response to 2. (a) as part of the overall total for CLIN 0001, and should not be included in the government NTE amount specified for CLIN 003 for proposal purposes. However, at time of contract award, the negotiated costs for travel and per diem for Task I may then be added to CLIN 0003, but the offeror should not do so at the proposal stage since the Government will evaluate proposed overtime, travel, and per diem for task I as part of the overall evaluation of the proposed approach to Task I. That is considered separate from the Government specified NTE amount for CLIN 0003 at this stage.

21. Question: Two questions with respect to Attachment (3), the Wage Determination and Attachment (9), the reconciliation of WD categories with the contract labor categories:

a.	Contract Categories	WD Categories and Requirements
	Sr. Logistician	01400 Supply Technician - \$9.34
	Logistician	21140 Store Worker I - \$8.73
	ILS Eng Asst	29084 Eng. Tech. IV - \$14.04

Page 135, Paragraph 17, addresses the qualifications for the ILS Assistant. That is the least demanding of the three categories listed above, yet it has been associated with a WD category whose minimum rate (\$14.04) is higher than the two other, more demanding categories. We think this is a mistake in classification and suggest that this contract category be associated with the WD category 03041 Computer Operator 1, \$7.47. Also, the confusion may be attributed to the fact that Attachment (9) and all the lists of non-key categories in the RFP refer to the

category as ILS Engineering Assistant. However, the description on Page 135 refers to it as being ILS Assistant (no Engineering involved). We think Page 135 is the correct reference. If our interpretation is correct, you may want to revise Attachment (9) and the listing of non-key categories on Pages 128 - 130.

Answer: Page 135, Paragraph 17: The title for the position on this page should read ILS Engineering Assistant. This position is not related to, or subservient to either the Senior Logistician (Paragraph 15, Page 134) or the Logistician (Paragraph 16, Page 135.)

Paragraph 17 , Page 135 is modified as follows:

17. ILS Engineering Assistant - NON-KEY

Education: A high school diploma or equivalent. Six months training at an accredited engineer's school such as a state operated vocational training institute or US Navy "A" school in the fields of Electronic Technician, Machinist Mate, or Engineman, or an alternate equivalent.

Experience: Three years recent experience as a qualified technician in engineering application support of submarine technology or marine mechanics of submersible vehicles. Three years experience providing engineering assistance in developing mechanical, electrical and/or electronic system preventative and corrective maintenance procedures; developing quality assurance procedures; developing writing, reviewing and implementing system operating procedures; logistic support procedures; and system configuration control documents from or using all types of prepared blueprints, technical manuals, sketches and drawings.

b. We feel the second to last category on Attachment (9) is mis-classified and should be revised. As listed, the Computer Operator Programmer is associated with the WD category 03043 Computer Operator III, \$11.8 1. We feel the qualifications required for the Computer Operator Programmer are more demanding and require more expertise than the above association recognizes. We suggest that it would be more appropriate to associate this category with the WD category 03 101 Computer Systems Analyst I. \$14.93.

Answer: It is the Government's position that the Computer Operator/Programmer position cited in the RFP is correctly associated with the WD Category 03043 Computer Operator III for the type of contracted support anticipated by this position.

This position would involve operational support of an existing network system and/or equipment which utilizes commercial off the shelf (COTS) software programs listed in Paragraph 26, Pages 136-137. Daily support anticipated for this position would involve monitoring and resolving common error conditions and running administrative / setup software subroutines that are inherently part of the COTS software programs and /or COTS personal computer (PC) operating systems. This position would not require any "system design analysis" support.

The suggested WD category 03101 Computer System Analyst I occupational base primarily involves development of computer system design specifications for computer programmer's to write software and/or writing computer programs him/herself. Considering that COTS software programs would be "operated" it is the Government's position that the WD category 03101 Computer System Analyst is not the correct association for the Computer Operator/ Programmer category.

22. Question: In Attachment 9, Wage Determination Categories/Contract Categories, the Contract Category Main Worker/Rigger has been matched to the Wage Determination Category Laborer. There is a Wage Determination Category for Rigger. If the person meeting the requirements of the Contract Category Main Worker/Rigger is expected to be a rigger, why wasn't this category matched to the WD Rigger category?

Answer: Qualifications of Personnel performing in the Maintenance Worker/Rigger Category are stated on Page 135. The skill associated with WD Category "Rigger" consists of the "design or development" of a rigging configuration for a hoisting evolution; and "selection" of rigging hardware to execute lifts.

The skills required by the RFP Maintenance Worker/Rigger category are general labor in nature which are not consistent with the WD Category Rigger.

The Maintenance Worker/Rigger category is expected to provide manual and/or general assistance for model configuration changes, maintenance and rigging/deployment operations under direction of other lead personnel, such as Senior Engineers, Mechanics and Technicians. Rigging support would consist of work such as line/cabling handling, handing/holding materials and/or tools to lead personnel, assisting with material loading, unloading, staging or movement which does not require any specialized rigger's certifications or licenses. This position would also utilize common hand, power, or air driven tools for assembly/disassembly of basic mechanical components, executed under direction or guidance of other lead positions.